

Protocol: A systematic review of the Goldberg-Huxley model of the pathway to psychiatric care.

Huxley, Peter; Gromadzka, Alicja; Nafees, Sadia; Krayner, Anne; University, Bangor

Published: 02/08/2021

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Huxley, P., Gromadzka, A., Nafees, S., Krayner, A., & University, B. (2021, Aug 2). Protocol: A systematic review of the Goldberg-Huxley model of the pathway to psychiatric care. (CRD42021270603 ed.) NIHR PROSPERO (International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews). https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021270603

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Citation

Peter Huxley, Alicja Gromadszka, Sadia Nafees, Anne Kraye, Daniel Lai Jie. A systematic review of the Goldberg-Huxley model of the pathway to psychiatric care. PROSPERO 2021 CRD42021270603 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021270603

Review question

The questions to be addressed by the review are, since the last update of the Goldberg-Huxley model:

- (1) Does epidemiological research still support the rates of disorder found at level 1 of the model?
- (2) Does epidemiological research still support the consultation rates at level 2?
- (3) What is the evidence about the permeability of the first filter to people with FEP (first episode psychosis)?

Searches

The following electronic databases will be searched from 2000 to 2019: MEDLINE via EBSCOhost,

PsycINFO via ProQuest, APA PsycNET, Embase and ScienceDirect via Elsevier, CINAHL via EBSCOhost, Web of Science and Web of Knowledge, PubMed, Google and Google Scholar.

No restrictions will be placed on language of publication.

The searches will be updated prior to analysis.

The search will focus on identifying original published studies in the form of articles published in peer-reviewed journals.

It is possible that some relevant studies may be published in doctoral theses, national surveys and government or other reports and so a brief search of the relevant literature will be undertaken using OpenGrey or a similar engine.

Additional search strategy information can be found in the attached PDF document (link provided below).

Types of study to be included

A study will be included if all the following four criteria are fulfilled:

- (1) It is published in full in a peer-reviewed journal (i.e. abstracts, letters, and other short communications will be excluded as these are unlikely to provide sufficient information to make the required judgements);
- (2) Its primary aim is to report on the whole or parts of the pathway to psychiatric care;
- (3) Relevant results are not duplicated elsewhere (where the same data are reported in more than one source, the more comprehensive version will be included);
- (4) A full text version can be obtained.

There will be no restrictions with regard to study design, setting or context of study, except for the exclusion of clinical trials

Condition or domain being studied

The pathway to psychiatric care.

Participants/population

General population surveys, primary care data, psychiatric morbidity data relating to adults up to the age of

65.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Not applicable (this review is looking at the Goldberg-Huxley model of the pathway to psychiatric care).

Comparator(s)/control

Not applicable.

Context

The Goldberg-Huxley model of the pathway to psychiatric care has been applied across a number of different health system settings in several countries. Most commonly studies have examined rates of psychiatric morbidity at some or all of the model's five levels, to thereby comment on the relative permeability of the filters. Pathways to Care studies have been used to evaluate access to care for specific disorders, to examine intervals along the pathway and to examine international differences in health systems. It provides a coherent framework to examine health service use and remains one of the most widely applied models of access to care in psychiatry. The model has not been updated fully since 2005.

Given that the early (lower) levels and filters are universally applicable and the criticism that the model is less adequate regarding FEP, we propose to limit this review to a focus on levels 1 and 2 and the first filter. The first filter is the individual decision to seek help from family, friends or other sources, and eventually to ask for professional help. Level two is, in many but not all places, primary health care.

Limiting the review this way raises the possibility of either, subsequent reviews examining other parts of the model in more detail, or using the results of this review to contribute to a full research proposal to review all of the current evidence regarding the use and continued applicability of the whole model. We will confine searches to pre-COVID-19 data, for obvious reasons.

Main outcome(s)

The results of the review will show the current situation about the pathway to psychiatric care compared to the earliest and latest reviews of the Goldberg-Huxley model.

Measures of effect

The results will be expressed as rates per 1000 population at risk.

Additional outcome(s)

None.

Measures of effect

Not applicable.

Data extraction (selection and coding)

Screening, article selection and data extraction will be undertaken independently by two reviewers. Discrepancies will be resolved via discussion or, where consensus cannot be reached, with recourse to a third reviewer.

The extracted data will be entered into a series of purpose-designed templates capturing study characteristics, descriptive information to inform quality ratings, and epidemiological results.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

We will follow the MOOSE guidelines so far as is practicable.

Strategy for data synthesis

Extracted data will be entered into a series of purpose-designed templates capturing study characteristics, descriptive information to inform quality ratings, and epidemiological results. We will follow the MOOSE guidelines, but data for the review questions will be quantitative and expressed as rates per 1000 population at risk as in the original model.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

None planned.

Contact details for further information

Peter Huxley
p.huxley@bangor.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review

Bangor University

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Professor Peter Huxley. Bangor University
Alicja Gromadszka. Bangor University
Sadia Nafees. Bangor University
Anne Kraye. Bangor University
Daniel Lai Jie. Bangor University

Type and method of review

Epidemiologic, Service delivery, Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date

09 August 2021

Anticipated completion date

24 December 2021

Funding sources/sponsors

None

Conflicts of interest

Language

English

Country

Wales

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Delivery of Health Care; Humans; Mental Disorders; Mental Health; Mental Health Services; Mentally Ill Persons; Psychotherapy; Psychotic Disorders

Date of registration in PROSPERO

02 August 2021

Date of first submission

29 July 2021

Stage of review at time of this submission

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions

02 August 2021